U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202-5335



ECEPD GRANT PERFORMANCE REPORT CFDA # 84.349A PR/Award # S349A040042 Budget Period # 1 Report Type: Final Performance

Table of Contents

Forms

1. Grant Performance Report Cover Sheet (ED 524B) - Revised 2005	ei
ED524BExecSummary	e:
2. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A	- 1 e ₂
3. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A	- 2 e14
4. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section B	& C e18
budget524BSectionBC	e19
Other524BSectionBC	e20

This report was generated using the PDF functionality. The PDF functionality automatically numbers the pages in this report. Some pages/sections of this report may contain 2 sets of page numbers, one set created by the applicant and the other set created by e-Report's PDF functionality. Page numbers created by the e-Report PDF functionality will be preceded by the letter e (for example, e1, e2, e3, etc.).



U.S. Department of Education Grant Performance Report Cover Sheet (ED 524B)

Check only one box per Program Office instructions.

[] Annual Performance Report [X] Final Performance Report

General Information

1. PR/Award #: **S349A040042**

(Block 5 of the Grant Award Notification.)

2. NCES ID #:

(See Instructions.)

- 3. Project Title: North Carolina Early Childhood Educator Professional Development Project (Enter the same title as on the approved application.)
- 4. Grantee Name(Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification.): Orelena Hawks Puckett Institute Learning Alliance
- 5. Grantee Address (See Instructions.): 18a Regent Park Blvd

City: Asheville State: NC Zip:28806 Zip+4:

6. Project Director: First Name Last Name Title

Melinda Raab

Phone #: Fax #: Email Address:

(828)255-0470 (828)255-9035 RAAB@PUCKETT.ORG

Reporting Period Information (See instructions.)

7. Reporting Period: From: 10/1/2006 To: 9/30/2007 (mm/dd/yyyy)

Budget Expenditures (To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions. Also see Section B.)

8. Budget Expenditures

o. Budget Expenditures	Federal Grant Funds	Non-Federal Funds (Match/Cost Share)
a. Previous Budget Period	996,793.00	997,312.00
b. Current Reporting Period	264,603.00	273,895.00
c. Entire Project Period (For Final Performance Reports only)	1,261,396.00	1,271,207.00

Indirect Cost Information (To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions.)

9. Indirect Costs

a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant?	IXI Yes
b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government?	[] No X Yes] No
c. If yes, provide the following information: Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: 10 (mm/dd/yyyy)	0/1/2006 To: 9/30/2008
Approving Federal agency: [X] ED [] Other (Please Specify Type of Rate (For Final Performance Reports Only): [X] Provise (Please Specify)	ional [] Final [] Other
d. For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) Are you using a re hat :	stricted indirect cost rate
Il Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreemen [X] Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?	ıt?
Human Subjects ((See instructions.)	
10. Annual Certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) Appro-	val? [X] Yes [] No
Performance Measures Status and Certification (See instructions	s.)
11. Performance Measures Status a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current bud Project Status Chart? [X] Yes [] No b. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Depart	
12. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performation correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning completeness of the data.	ance report are true and
Name of Authorized Representative: Carl J Dunst	Title: President
Signature:	Date:
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Executive Summary Atta	chment:
File: ED524BExecSummary File: C:\Documents and Settings\mraab\Desktop\ED524BExecSum	<u>ımary.doc</u>



U.S. Department of Education Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Executive Summary

OMB No. 1890 - 0004 Expiration: 10-31-2007

PR/Award #: (Please Enter)

North Carolina Early Childhood Educator Professional Development Project

The purpose of the North Carolina Early Childhood Educator Professional Development Project was to improve the knowledge and skills of early childhood educators working in high need communities in western North Carolina, promoting young children's school readiness. Professional development was offered through a partnership between the Puckett Institute Learning Alliance, Asheville and Morganton, NC; and the Family, Infant and Preschool Program, Morganton NC.

The major project objectives were:

- Promote early childhood educators' understanding and use of scientifically-based early childhood practices
- Promote early childhood educators' abilities to enhance the language and literacy learning of young children in high need communities.
- Promote early childhood educators' abilities to support parents in providing their children everyday learning opportunities.

Project Model

The project used an integrated framework, which considers the social systems and environmental variables associated with development-enhancing consequences (Dunst, 1999, 2000), for conceptualizing how early childhood educators can support the school readiness of young children. Four key dimensions comprise the model: Child learning opportunities, parenting supports, family/community resources, and family-centered practices. *Child learning opportunities* are learning activities characterized by behavioral and development instigating and enhancing features. *Parenting supports* are the provision and/or mobilization of supports strengthening existing and promoting new, parenting knowledge and competence. *Family and community supports* involve the mobilization of resources providing parents the time and energy to carry out child-rearing and parenting responsibilities. *Family-centered practices* are practices that place families in central roles in decisions and actions in ways supporting and strengthening child and family competence.

Design

A randomized experimental-control group design was planned for the project. However, the project was not able to maintain this design, assigning teachers randomly to control and treatment groups, because of difficulty recruiting enough teachers from programs that met both ECEPD program eligibility criteria (i.e., the program is located in a high poverty area and the program serves a high percentage of low income children). Teachers asking to participate and whose programs met both eligibility criteria were

assigned to our treatment (professional development) group. To address the need for additional control sites, we included in the control group teachers from a variety of early childhood programs (e.g., Head Start programs), most of which met both ECEPD eligibility criteria while others met one of the two criteria. Teachers in the control group did not receive project training, but were observed in their classrooms to assess their implementation of classroom practices.

Project Participants

Programs/Classrooms

Sixty classrooms in nineteen programs serving infants, toddlers, and preschool age children in 8 western North Carolina counties participated in the project's professional development. The programs were located in high need communities (identified by either census block or school attendance area of schools serving high populations of children who qualified for lunch assistance) and served high populations of children from low income families. Seventy percent of the programs were nonprofit or privately operated childcare programs, 25% Head Start programs, and 5% Early Head Start. Fifty percent of the 60 classrooms served children birth to 3 years of age, and the remainder served children 3 through 5 years of age. The majority of classrooms (58%) had two adults (teacher, teacher assistant). The mean number of children served in a classroom was 11.63 (SD = 4.58).

Thirty-one classrooms in 11 programs were included in a control group. The types of programs included 45% Head Start, 36% nonprofit or privately operated childcare programs, 9% Early Head Start, and 9% public preschool. Fifty-eight percent of the classrooms served children birth through 3 years f age, and the remainder served children 3 through 5 years of age. The mean number of children served in the classrooms was 10.03.

Teachers

One hundred twenty-six teachers and teacher assistants participated in professional development during this project. The mean age of the teachers was 35.34 years (SD = 13.29). Thirty percent were 18 – 25 years of age; 46 % were between 26 and 45 years of age; and 26% were over 45 years. Sixty-nine percent of the teachers had only a high school education. Another 20% had an associate degree, and 9% had a bachelor's degree. One teacher had a master's degree. On average, the teachers had 8.11 years (SD = 8.17) experience working with young children and had spent 2.42 years (SD = 3.73) in their current position. More than half the teachers had been in their current positions for one year or less.

The control group consisted of 69 teachers and teacher assistants. The mean age of control group participants was 36 years. Twenty-nine percent were 25 years of age, 49 % were between 26 and 45 years of age; and 22% were over 45 years. Seventy percent had only a high school education. Twenty-three percent had an associate degree, and 7%

had a bachelor's degree. Teachers had an average of 8.28 years (SD = 8.61) working with young children, and had been in their current positions an average of 2.23 years (SD = 4.05). Fifty-eight percent had been in their current positions for one year or less.

Children

The participating classrooms served 698 children, including 266 children (38%) birth -3 years of age and 432 children (62%) 3-5 years of age. The ethnicity of the children included Caucasian (43%), African American (31%), Hispanic (18%), and other. Up to six children were identified in each classroom for collection of outcome data.

The number of children in treatment group programs who participated in the project for collection of outcome data was 311, 49% of whom were birth – 3 years of age at the start of the project, and 51% of whom were 3 – 5 years of age. Fifty five percent of these children were male, and the ethnic composition of the group was 50% Caucasian, 26% African American, 14% Hispanic, and 10% other. Twelve percent of the children had been identified as having a disability or developmental delay, and 10% were reported to receive intervention services.

Procedures

Content of Professional Development

The content of professional development derived from the conceptual and research foundations of each component of the integrated framework, which were used to develop four classroom practices planners and three family/community practices planners that defined practices supporting young children's school readiness. Each planner, which provided the basis for the training content on the respective component, included six sets of indicators specifying evidence-based practice standards used to guide teachers' learning. The following is the focus of the four classroom practices planners:

- The *Child Literacy Learning Practices Planner* included practices that helped teachers provide children experiences that supported their acquisition of skills and abilities around spoken and written language and recognizing and understanding print.
- The *Learning Opportunity Characteristics Practices Planner* included practices that helped teachers provide children learning opportunities that supported their becoming independent learners.
- The *Instructional Practices Planner* included practice indicators that helped teachers use a range of teaching strategies that support children in learning and acquiring new knowledge and skills, including both child-initiated and adult-initiated methods.
- The *Classroom Organization Practices Planner* included practice indicators that helped teachers operate their classrooms in ways that supported young children's engagement with activities, materials, other children, and adults.

The focus of the three family/community practices planners was:

- The *Family Centered Practices Planner* included practice indicators focusing on interactions between early childhood teachers and parents that strengthened parents' abilities to promote their children's learning.
- The *Parenting Supports Planner* included practices designed to help early childhood teachers provide parents advice, information, guidance, assistance, and so forth, desired by parents to strengthen and acquire childrearing knowledge and skills.
- The *Family and Community Resources Planner* included practices designed to help early childhood teachers promote parent's use of community resources (e.g., activities, people, organizations, and services) that give them the time and energy to parent their children and strengthen their abilities to provide children learning opportunities.

Adult Learning Process

The project developed an adult learning process to guide delivery of the project's professional development, integrating characteristics of accelerated learning, coaching, and findings from the National Research Council's research synthesis on how people learn. Key features of the process included the use of evidence-based early childhood classroom practices as "standards against which" teachers learned and reviewed their own practices, (b) teachers' active participation in their own learning, and (c) the responsiveness to and individualization of a teacher's learning in the context of the common elements of the process. The process involved three areas of teacher engagement: *planning*, *practicing*, and *gaining deeper understanding* of the early childhood classroom practices.

- *Planning* involved assisting teachers to examine their current understanding and implementation of the targeted practices compared to the practice standards and identify the kinds of experiences that could promote their learning to implement targeted classroom practices.
- **Practicing** involved engaging the teachers in a variety of opportunities (based on their plans for learning experiences) that promoted their skills and understanding to implement the practices, including observing practices demonstrated in the classroom, trying out the practices with assistance, being observed implementing the practices, using the practice standards as the basis for reflecting on their implementation and receiving feedback on their use of the practices.
- Gaining deeper understanding involved creating opportunities for teachers to refine their skills around the targeted practices, learn more about the foundations of the practices and expected outcomes for children, apply their learning in other situations in the classroom, and relate their understanding and experience practices in other components of the integrated framework.

Professional development was provided by six primary project faculty, five of whom had master's degrees in early childhood and one of whom had a doctoral degree. Five of the staff had more than 10 years experience working with teachers of young children. Visits were made to teachers' classrooms 3 – 4 times per month over approximately an 8-month period of time for provision of professional development

using the adult learning process described above. The planners were used throughout the professional development to engage teachers in planning, practicing, and gaining deeper understanding of the practice standards. As teachers' became knowledgeable and proficient in a component of classroom practices, training was delivered in another component until all components were covered.

Measures

Implementation Measures

Three measures were used to assess teachers' adoption and use of the early childhood practices. The *Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation* (ELLCO; Smith & Dickinson, 2002) was used to assess classroom practices promoting early language and literacy development. An adaptation of the *Teaching Styles Rating Scale* (TSRS; McWilliam, Scarborough, Bagby, & Sweeny, 1998) was used to assess the quality of early childhood educators' interaction behaviors and affective behaviors with children. A project-developed tool, the *Classroom Practices Observation Scales* (CPOS, Raab, Dunst, & Trivette, 2005) was used to assess practitioners' adoption and use of early childhood practices in each of the seven areas on which they received training. The CPOS included seven observation scales corresponding to the project planners, each with practice indicators for six areas of practice. Each practice indicator was rated on a five-point scale indicating different levels of implementation ranging from non-use to modifying use of the practice based on evaluation and reflection

Child Outcomes

Child outcome measures used to assess children's early language and literacy abilities were administered by project staff on three occasions: at the beginning of training, and again approximately 4 and 8 months after training began. These measures included the *Early Literacy Skills Screener* (Shue, 2004), a measure of preschool children's pre-literacy knowledge and skills, and the *Preschool Language Scale – Fourth Edition* (PLS-4, Zimmerman, Steiner, & Pond, 2002), used to assess children's receptive and expressive language.

Project Findings

Child Outcomes

For English-speaking children who were administered the PLS-4 at both pretest and posttest, the percentages of children whose standard scores increased by 4 or more points from pretest to posttest were 57.6%, 54.2%, and 58.2% for the Auditory Comprehension, Expressive Language, and PLS Total Language scales, respectively. For Spanish-speaking children who were administered the Spanish PLS at both pretest and posttest, the percentages whose standard scores increased by 4 or more points from pretest to posttest were 63.2% 47.4%, and 63.2% for the Auditory Comprehension, Expressive Language, and SPLS Total Language scales, respectively.

The percentages of children who scored at or above a standard score of 85 on the English PLS-4 at posttest was 90.4%, 92.7%, and 91.5% for the Auditory Comprehension subtest,

the Expressive Language subtest, and the PLS Total Language score, respectively. The percentages of Spanish-speaking children who scored at or above a standard score of 85 on the Spanish PLS at posttest were 94.7% for each of the Auditory Comprehension, the Expressive Language, and the SPLS Total Language scores.

The mean number of uppercase and lowercase letters from the letter identification subtest of the Early Literacy Skills Screener that were identified at the posttest was 6.84. The mean percent of letters that were identified was 24.46%. Nineteen percent of the children who were tested identified more than 15 letters at posttest.

Teacher Outcomes

For teachers who were observed at posttest using the ELLCO, the mean post-test scores for the Literacy Environment Checklist, Classroom Observation, and Literacy Activities Rating Scale were 25.89, 46.70, and 6.89, respectively. Compared to teachers in the control group, teachers receiving training had higher rates of improvement in their use of early literacy practices.

Findings based on observations of teachers' practices using project-developed observation scales that paralleled the training content indicated that teachers participating in the project's professional development also had greater rates of improvement in practices for all seven project training components compared to teachers not receiving training.

Teachers participating in professional development also had greater rates of improvement in teacher interactional behaviors (responsive, engaging, elaborative) than did teachers not receiving training. There were no significant differences in teacher affect between the control and treatment group over the course of the project.

Contributions of the Project

The project findings provide evidence of the effectiveness of the project's adult learning process for promoting teachers' understanding and use of evidence-based classroom practices, and they contribute to our understanding of the characteristics of training strategies that have positive outcomes for both teachers and children. Providing intensive, sustained, on-site training, relevant to teachers' immediate work settings, with opportunities for practice, reflection, and feedback proved to be an effective approach with teachers in the participating classrooms.

This project also contributes to practice by providing trainers, professional development providers, and others responsible for promoting teacher adoption and use of effective early childhood classroom practices training strategies that can promote teacher's active participation in their own learning. It provides program directors and policy makers information useful for making informed choices about teacher training models and methods suited for making optimal impacts on teacher practices and outcomes for children.



PR/Award #: **S349A040042**

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1.1. Performance Measure	Measure Type			Qu	antitative Data		
The percent of preschool-aged children participating in		Ta	rget		Actual Perf	ormance Data	
ECEPD projects who achieve significant learning gains on		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III (PPVT-			/			/	
III), defined as a standard score increase of 4 or more points between pre-and post-test. 1.2. Performance Measure	Measure Type			Qu	antitative Data		
The percent of preschool-aged	GPRA	Ta	rget		Actual Perf	ormance Data	
children participating in ECEPD projects who demonstrate age appropriate		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
oral language skills, defined as	3		/			/	
a standard score of 85 or higher, as measured by the PPVT-III.							

1.3. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The number of letters ECEPD	GPRA	Target Actual P			Actual Perf	erformance Data	
children can identify as measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Knowledge subtask.			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information) Performance Measure 1.1:

Because our project evaluation plan was developed and implementation was begun before the PPVT-III was identified as a common measure for ECEPD projects, this project used the Preschool Language Scale-4th edition (PLS-4) to assess changes in children's receptive and expressive language. The PPVT-III was not administered in this project.

Children who were English-speaking were tested with the English version of the PLS-4. For children who received the English version of the PLS only, who participated for 6 months or longer, and who had both pre-test and post-test, the findings are as follows:

311 Total number of eligible children

102/177 Ratio of the number of children with a gain of 4 or more standard points on the Auditory Comprehension subtest of the PLS-4 to number of children with a pre-test and post-test PLS-4

57.6 Percent of children with a gain of 4 or more standard points on the Auditory Comprehension subtest of the PLS-4

96/177 Ratio of the number of children with a gain of 4 or more standard points on the Expressive Language subtest of the PLS-4 to number of children with a pre-test and post-test PLS-4

54.2 Percent of children with a gain of 4 or more standard points on the Expressive Language subtest of the PLS-4

103/177 Ratio of the number of children with a gain of 4 or more standard points on the Total Language scale of the PLS-4 to number of children with a pre-test and post-test PLS-4

58.2 Percent of children with a gain of 4 or more standard points on the Total Language scale of the PLS-4

The discrepancy between the number of eligible children and the number of children who received both a pretest and posttest was due to a number of factors. Thirty-two children were administered the Spanish version of the PLS-4 and therefore are not included in the statistics for the English version of the PLS-4. Thirty-five children were administered a pretest and an interim test but did not receive the posttest. Other children left the programs or were transferred to other classrooms before the administration of the interim test. On some occasions, children were not able to be tested because of illness, or, rarely, because they refused to participate in the testing.

Of all the children who were administered only the English version of the PLS, in addition to the children who received both pretest and posttest, 35 children received a pretest assessment and another assessment at the midpoint of professional development, approximately four months later. These were children who withdrew from the programs after being assessed at the midpoint but before being assessed at posttest. The following are the findings for this group of children based on their interim standard scores:

The percentages of children whose standard scores increased by 4 or more points from pretest to the interim assessment were 65.7% (23/35), 54.3% (19/35), and 54.3% (19/35) for the Auditory Comprehension, Expressive Language, and PLS Total Language scales, respectively.

The average increase in PLS-4 total language standard scores from pretest to the interim assessment for these 35 children was 5.71 points.

Spanish Preschool Language Scale (SPLS-4):

Of the 32 children who were tested with the Spanish PLS because their primary language was Spanish, 19 children were tested both the pretest and posttest occasions. The following are the findings for the posttest standard scores from the SPLS-4:

The percentages of children whose standard scores increased by 4 or more points from pretest to posttest were 63.2% (12/19), 47.4% (9/19), and 63.2% (12/19) for the Auditory Comprehension, Expressive Language, and SPLS Total Language scales, respectively.

The average increase in SPLS total language standard scores from pretest to posttest was 6 points.

These 19 children also were tested with the English version of the PLS-4 and had both pre-and post-tests. The percentages of children whose standard scores on the English PLS increased by 4 or more points from pretest to posttest were 63.2% (12/19), 63.2% (12/19), and 73.7% (14/19) for the Auditory Comprehension, Expressive Language, and PLS Total

Language scales, respectively.

Performance Measure 1.2:

The PPVT-III was not administered in this project. The following results are reported for children who were tested using the Preschool Language Scale-4th Edition, English version only, and who had both a pretest and posttest. Previous reports of this information included children who were Spanish-speaking who also were tested with the English version of the PLS-4. The following results excludes those children.

311 Total number of eligible children

160/177 Ratio of the number of children with a standard score of 85 or higher on the Auditory Comprehension subtest of the PLS-4 to number of children with a pre-test and post-test PLS-4

90.4 Percent of children with a standard score of 85 or higher on the Auditory Comprehension subtest of the PLS-4

164/177 Ratio of the number of children with a standard score of 85 or higher on the Expressive Language subtest of the PLS-4 to number of children with a pre-test and post-test PLS-4

92.7 Percent of children with a standard score of 85 or higher on the Expressive Language subtest of the PLS-4

162/177 Ratio of the number of children with a standard score of 85 or higher on the Total Language scale of the PLS-4 to number of children with a pre-test and post-test PLS-4

91.5 Percent of children with a standard score of 85 or higher on the Total Language scale of the PLS-4

The 35 children who received only the pretest and interim PLS-4 assessments had the following results:

At interim, the mean standard scores for Auditory Comprehension, Expressive Language, and PLS Total Language were 99.06, 100.77, and 100.09, respectively.

The percentages of children who scored at or above a standard score of 85 at the interim assessment were 85.7% (30/35), 80% (28/35), and 77.1% (27/35), for the Auditory Comprehension subtest, the Expressive Language subtest, and the PLS Total Language score, respectively.

The 19 Spanish-speaking children who had both the pretest and posttest of the SPLS-4 and the English PLS-4 had the following results:

For the Spanish PLS, the mean posttest standard scores for Auditory Comprehension, Expressive Language, and SPLS Total Language were 107.63, 105.32, and 107.84 respectively.

The percentages of children who scored at or above a standard score of 85 on the Spanish PLS at posttest were 94.7% for each of the Auditory Comprehension, the Expressive Language, and the SPLS Total Language scores.

For the English PLS, the mean posttest standard scores for Auditory Comprehension, Expressive Language, and SPLS Total Language were 87.68, 81.42, and 83.0 respectively.

The percentages of children who scored at or above a standard score of 85 on the English PLS at posttest were 52.6% (10/19), 47.4% (9/19), and 63.2% (12/19) for the Auditory Comprehension, the Expressive Language, and the PLS Total Language scores, respectively.

Performance Measure 1.3:

This project's evaluation plan called for administering the Early Literacy Skills Screener (ELSS) rather than the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask. The ELSS includes an alphabet knowledge subtest that includes a total of 28 letters (14 upper case and 14 lower case letters). Only children 3 years old and older were tested. Of 131 English-speaking children who received the pretest, 95 were administered the posttest. The mean number of uppercase and lowercase letters from this subtest identified at the posttest was 6.84. The mean percent of letters that were identified was 24.46%. Nineteen percent of these children identified more than 15 letters.



PR/Award #: **S349A040042**

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

2 . **Project Objective** Il Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Early childhood educators will more frequently apply research-based approaches in early childhood instruction and child development and learning, including establishing literacy-rich classrooms.

2.1. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data						
ECEPD teachers' average	GPRA	Ta	arget		Actual Performance Data			
score on the ELLCO subpart Literacy Environment Checklist after intervention.		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%	
			/			/		
2.2. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data						
Changes in teachers' PROJ		Target			Actual Performance Data			
implementation of early childhood classroom practices on which they received		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%	
training compared to those of teachers not receiving training			/			/		
teachers not receiving training	· <u> </u>							
2.3. Performance Measure	Measure Type			Quar	ntitative Data			
Changes in teachers' abilities	PROJ	Ta	arget		Actual Per	formance Data		
to support parents in providing their children everyday		Raw			Raw			

learning opportunities (i.e., changes in teachers'		Number	Ratio	%	Number	Ratio	%
implementation of			/			/	
family/community practices on							
which they received training)							
2.4. Performance Measure	Measure Type			Qu	antitative Data		
8	PROJ	Ta	rget		Actual Perfe	ormance Data	
Changes in teachers' use of interactional styles supporting child learning compared with that of teachers not receiving	PROJ	Ta Raw Number	rget Ratio	%	Actual Perfo Raw Number	Prmance Data Ratio	%
interactional styles supporting child learning compared with	PROJ	Raw		%	Raw		%

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information) Performance Measure 2.1:

The ELLCO was administered in preschool classrooms of participating teachers serving three-, four-, or five-year-old children. (We did not assess participating classrooms serving infants, toddlers, and two-year olds.) The ELLCO was administered at baseline in 30 classrooms with 54 teachers. The post assessment was conducted in 27 classrooms with 45 teachers. Teachers resigning from the programs, taking time off for extended illness, or otherwise being away from the program for a period of time were the primary reasons for attrition. The mean post-test scores for the Literacy Environment Checklist, Classroom Observation, and Literacy Activities Rating Scale were 25.89, 46.70, and 6.89, respectively.

For each ELLCO subscale, separate repeated measures analysis of variance (using the BMPD statistical program 5V) were conducted to examine the extent to which project training was associated with changes in teachers' early literacy practices over time compared with teachers who did not receive training. There was a significant Group x Time Period interaction for each analysis (p < .0000, d = 1.58 for the Literacy Environment Checklist; p < .0000, effect size d = 1.76 for Classroom Observation; and p < .03, d = .63 for the Literacy Activities Checklist), indicating that compared to teachers in the control group, teachers who participated in the project's professional development had greater rates of improvement in their use of early literacy practices in the classroom.

Performance Measure 2.2:

Four project-developed observation scales were used to assess teachers' adoption and use of the early childhood classroom

practices on which training was provided. The four scales corresponded to the subject areas of the four classroom practices planners that were used as the basis for the training content (i.e., child literacy learning practices, child learning opportunities characteristics practices, instructional practices, and classroom organization practices). Each practice indicator was rated on a five-point scale from 1 = Nonuse of the Practice to 5 = Institutionalizes the Practice.

Teachers in both the treatment and control groups were observed on at least three occasions over an 8-month period. Separate repeated measures analysis of variance (using the BMPD statistical program 5V) were conducted to examine the extent to which project training was associated with changes in teachers' use of the early childhood practices over time for each of the four classroom practices training components. Wald-type chi-square statistics and effect sizes (Cohen's d) were computed. For each of the four classroom practices scales, there was a significant Group x Time Period interaction (p < .0000 for each scale, effect sizes d = 9.85 for child literacy learning practices, d = 2.79 for learning opportunities characteristics practices, d = 2.04 for classroom organization practices, and d = 2.72 for instructional practices), indicating that compared to teachers in the control group, teachers in classrooms receiving project training had higher rates of improvement in child literacy learning practices, learning opportunity characteristics practices, classroom organization practices, and instructional practices.

Performance Measure 2.3:

Three project-developed observation scales were used to assess teachers' adoption and use of the family/community practices on which training was provided. The three scales corresponded to the subject areas of the three family/community practices planners that were used as the basis for the training content, and focused on family-centered practices, parenting supports practices, and community resources practices. Each practice indicator was rated on a five-point scale from 1 = N onuse of the Practice to 5 = I Institutionalizes the Practice. Repeated measures analysis of variance were used to the extent to which project training was associated with changes in teachers' use of the family/community practices over time for each of the three family/community training components. For each of the three components, there was a significant Group x Time Period interaction (family-centered practices, p < .0000; parenting supports practices, p < .0006; community resources, p < .0001). Cohen's d effect sizes were 1.21 for family centered practices, .78 for parenting supports, and .92 for community resources practices.

Performance Measure 2.4:

An observational measure of teacher interactional styles was used to assess teacher behavior (i.e., composite score of ratings of responsive, engaging, and elaborative interactions) and teacher affect (composite score of ratings of positive and negative expression, physical and emotional warmth, sensitivity to the child's interests, consistency, and child directedness). Repeated measures analysis of variance was used to examine the extent to which the project's professional development was associated with teachers' use of responsive interactional styles. There was a significant Group x Time Period interaction for the teacher behavior measure (p < .0000, effect size Cohen's d = .88), indicating that the rate of improvement for teachers who received professional development was greater than that for teachers not receiving training. There was not a significant

Group x Time Period interaction for the teacher affect measure.



PR/Award #: **S349A040042**

SECTION B - Budget Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

Title: budget524BSectionBC

File: C:\Documents and Settings\mraab\Desktop\budget524BSectionBC.doc

SECTION C - Additional Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

Title: Other524BSectionBC

File: C:\Documents and Settings\mraab\Desktop\Other524BSectionBC.doc



OMB No. 1890 - 0004 Expiration: 10-31-2007

PR/Award #:

SECTION B - Budget Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

Project funds were used primarily to cover the costs of personnel and travel to the individual programs where teachers participated in professional development. Funds initially were not expended at the expected rate because recruiting and hiring project staff to provide professional development took longer than expected. The project also spent time developing/refining the professional development model and training content before some of the staff were hired. The no cost extension allowed funds to be used to complete project activities.



OMB No. 1890 - 0004 Expiration: 10-31-2007

PR/Award #:

SECTION C - Additional Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

The project demonstrated that the provision of professional development using an evidence-based adult learning approach that involved intensive on-site training in the context of teachers' classrooms can be successful in promoting teachers' adoption of classroom practices supporting children's early language and literacy learning and promoting school readiness. A strength of this project was that conceptual frameworks were used to guide both the content of the professional development and the methods employed to deliver the professional development.

The content of the professional development was based on a conceptual framework that integrated the different early childhood practices known to influence positive outcomes for children. We developed and used "practice standards" based on research evidence as the primary content for seven interrelated areas of early childhood practices. The breadth of our project model that guided the training content was advantageous. We learned that some teachers needed assistance learning about even the most basic of early childhood practices, and our project model provided the foundation for addressing these needs in order then to provide a context for teachers to implement early language and literacy learning practices.

The procedures used for delivering professional development were guided by an adult learning process that actively involved teachers in planning, practicing, and gaining deeper understanding of the practices. A major strength of the process was the use of practice standards against which teachers could review their own practice and assess what they were doing in terms of the extent to which they were consistent with desired practices. The adult learning process included strategies to help teachers gain a deeper understanding of the training content so they could monitor and adjust their practices based on observations of outcomes for children, and apply the practices in different situations and with different children.

The provision of professional development on an individualized basis in the context of teachers' classrooms made it possible to assist teachers in applying their learning to the situations and concerns they faced on an everyday basis. Providing training in teachers' classrooms also made it possible to involve teachers who otherwise may not have participated in professional development. We initially planned to provide both group trainings and individual on-site training, but quickly became aware that teachers were neither able nor willing to attend group training outside the context of their work settings and schedules.

Major barriers for this project were the high turnover rate for teachers of young children in western North Carolina, the absence of teachers from the programs for periods of time because of personal problems, and teachers frequently being reassigned to different classrooms in a program, making the continuity of training in context difficult. Another barrier was the frequency at which programs reassigned children, particularly infants and toddlers, to different classrooms. Future professional development using this approach could benefit from the provision of additional supports to program directors who are in a position to implement practices stabilizing their programs and classrooms in terms of teacher and child movement.